



Setti D. Warren
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Development
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Candace Havens
Director

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS
CHESTNUT HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

DATE: April 17, 2014

PLACE/TIME: City Hall, Room 202
7:30 p.m.

ATTENDING: Joyce Dostale, Acting-Chair
William Roesner, Member
Samuel Perry, Alternate
Peter Vieira, Alternate
Katy Holmes, Staff
Barbara Kurze, Commission Staff
See Attendance List

ABSENT: John Wyman, Chair
Robert Imperato, Member

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with Joyce Dostale presiding as Acting-Chair. Voting permanent members were Joyce Dostale and William Roesner. Alternate members Samuel Perry and Peter Vieira were appointed to vote as full members. Barbara Kurze acted as recording secretary and the meeting was digitally recorded on an H2 Zoom recording device.

32 Suffolk Road – Certificate of Appropriateness

Guy Grassi of Grassi Design Group represented the prospective owner of the property and presented the project; the project was first presented at the March 20th meeting. G. Grassi noted that the original property was a small house which had been added to four or five times and that the house was marginally visible at the end of the long driveway from Suffolk Road. S. Perry noted that the rear of the house was also visible from the MBTA Green Line. G. Grassi stated that the intent was to make the visually important sections of the house – the front entry and front elevation – more appropriate for the current scale of the house.

G. Grassi provided a recap of what was presented at the March 20th meeting and identified the revisions to the drawings as follows:

- Changed cladding for the proposed center front dormers to slate; the Commission had approved the proposed dormer design but requested slate cladding that matched the

existing flanking dormers. W. Roesner asked if the slate would match the roof slate; G. Grassi stated that it would match.

- Retained original door and transom; the Commission had rejected the proposed replacement glass and steel double door.
- Changed portico material to painted wood; the Commission had rejected the proposed cast stone.
- Simplified some of the balustrade details; balustrade would also be painted wood.
- Simplified the original door enframing so that it would work with the portico.

G. Grassi presented details of the proposed design changes to simplify the original enframing. The door, transom and pair of colonettes (quarter columns) would remain. G. Grassi proposed the two pilasters and the architrave would be cut off on top and would be surrounded with new six-inch or six-and-a-half-inch wide casing to complete the woodwork around the door. New pilasters would replace the existing ones under the beam of returns of the portico. G. Grassi noted that he expected to find brick behind the pilasters, but that if they did not, they expect to be able to match the brick.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Site Plan

Elevations

Plans

Discussion ensued regarding the appropriateness and visibility of the proposed ball finial for the portico and roof balustrades. S. Perry expressed concern that the ball finial was more ornate than the Colonial Revival designs of Bigelow and Wadsworth and questioned the scale; he noted that there was a precedent of keeping changes in character with what the architect would have done. J. Dostale commented that the impression of the house should fit with the era and the original architecture. G. Grassi commented that it was a common design element for a Georgian balustrade and that it was an appropriate design element for the current scale of the house. G. Grassi stated that the dimensions of the ball finial on top of the pilaster would match the dimensions of the top of the pilaster below which was typical; would be a 10 inch ball on a 15 to 16 foot tall pilaster. P. Vieira and W. Roesner commented that the distance from the public way made the ball finials less of an issue. P. Vieira commented that he had seen bad uses of this design, but that he accepted that the building had changed over time which opened the door for other scale elements. S. Perry commented that the overall design was a great improvement. J. Dostale commented that she liked the new, simpler direction of the design and the use of wood.

W. Roesner motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted. P. Vieira seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 4-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 17, 2014

SUBJECT: 32 Suffolk Road - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 17, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 32 Suffolk Road to amend the front portico and balustrade plan.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Joyce Dostale, Acting Chair
Peter Vieira, Alternate

William Roesner, Member

Samuel Perry, Alternate

350 Beacon Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Ryan Donahue with Robert Marcus Real Estate represented the owner of the property (Boston College) and presented the project to replace approximately 20 windows which tested positive for lead; the inside jambs and sills and interior stops were fine but the sash, exterior trim and sill tested positive. He stated that new tenants with a small child had planned to move in in mid-May. Approximately 16 windows were double hung and four were casement. The casement windows included a quadruple window with diamond lights and aluminum storm windows in the front elevation. The proposed replacements would be Pella Architect Series windows custom-built to match the existing windows – sashes, muntins, muntin details, and window light size. R. Donahue stated that they did not plan to touch the exterior siding as they would insert the replacement windows in the existing openings. R. Donahue noted that the original proposal was for mahogany windows but because mahogany material would not be available in time for the tenant move-in date, he requested to be allowed to present the same design but with pine material which had a much shorter lead-time.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Materials information

S. Perry asked about the existing material and noted that not matching the existing wood might cause issues if the replacement shrank; he noted that it could be less expensive to rebuild and remove the lead. R. Donahue stated that the windows were painted so did not know what the material was. S. Perry asked when the building was constructed; B. Kurze noted that the inventory form had a date of 1941 and identified the architect as C.C. Crowell. P. Vieira asked whether the windows were original; R. Donahue stated that he believed they were. P. Vieira noted that removing the exterior storm sash would expose the windows to weather; R. Donahue stated that if the Commission recommended keeping the storm windows, they could put them back on.

W. Roesner asked why mahogany had a longer lead-time; Kevin Gerhart, member of the public and representative for Pella Windows stated that because the windows were made to order and mahogany was more expensive, the company did not have as much inventory. S. Perry noted that mahogany was more stable and sealing and was a higher quality than pine; mahogany replacements would also last longer.

J. Dostale asked if the existing windows were single or double pane; R. Donahue stated that he believed the existing windows were double pane and that the replacement windows would be double pane, simulated divided-light and that the details of muntins would be identical. P. Vieira noted that there were no job-specific details and asked if the intent was to replicate the sash and exterior surround; R. Donahue stated that it was. R. Donahue noted that they planned to keep the

existing wired-glass garage windows as they were original; W. Roesner and S. Perry stated that wired glass was not allowed per code and that they should change garage windows.

Discussion ensued as to whether the Commission had approved pine windows in the past. Commission members noted that most original windows were hard wood and that mahogany was more stable. W. Roesner and J. Dostale expressed concern that the diamond lights would be replaced; W. Roesner noted that these were expensive windows and J. Dostale stated that the casements were intricate and mattered more stylistically.

J. Dostale motioned to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application as submitted and specified as the replacement of approximately 20 windows that would include the garage windows and specified with the mahogany wood material. S. Perry seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 4-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 17, 2014

SUBJECT: 350 Beacon Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 17, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 350 Beacon Street to replace approximately 20 windows and specified as the replacement of approximately 20 windows that would include the garage windows and specified with the mahogany wood material.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Joyce Dostale, Acting Chair
Peter Vieira, Alternate

William Roesner, Member

Samuel Perry, Alternate

25 Chestnut Hill Terrace – Certificate of Appropriateness

Scot Indermuehle of Sudbury Design Group, represented the property owners (Robert and Laurette Bachman) and presented the proposed replacement deck and added terrace and fence. S. Indermuehle described the existing property as a two-story brick colonial with a walkout basement on a relatively small lot with an abutting garage to the east , another garage near Beacon Street to the south and another garage to the north. S. Indermuehle showed photos of the Beacon Street and Chestnut Hill Terrace views of the property. S. Indermuehle stated that there was an existing deck in the small backyard and that a renovation of the sunroom was approved in 1997; in 2008 they applied under special permit to expand the sunroom four feet, taking the expansion out of the deck area. The deck was 17 years old; the second floor deck off the first floor was flush with finished floor, the interior floor was rubble, the construction was wrapped PT frame with mahogany floor, balusters and railings, and the rest of the material was probably painted cedar. S. Indermuehle presented the proposed project and changes as follows:

- Reprogrammed and modified the deck; moved staircase from the middle of the deck to create more usable space. Moved staircase would leave landing flush to first floor. Basement door and basement windows prevented lower frame at that point, so went up

and over. Did want to lower the deck elsewhere so would have a lower deck except where the basement windows were.

- Introduced connecting patio to eliminate separation of spaces. Elevated 30 inches at the ground level; reduced stairs and created mid-level from the deck to the basement level. Matched grade, repaved existing paver and added steps down to the paver.
- Made area more private. Replaced existing stockade fence with six-foot architectural fence with solid board and lattice topper. The second floor would be screened by two Norwegian spruce trees which they would keep. Had recommendation to remove another tree which was decayed.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Elevations

Plans

Materials information

W. Roesner commented that the proposed fence would look better if was extended similar the existing fence instead of closing off the property and losing sense of space by turning into the corner; S. Indermuehle stated that the current fence and driveway extended beyond the property line; they wanted to respect the lot lines. W. Roesner proposed that show design of the extended fence to the neighbors and see if they would approve extending the fence beyond the property line; otherwise consider just extending the fence to the property line. S. Indermuehle commented that it would be more obvious to leave the six-foot opening.

S. Indermuehle stated that they reviewed the deck modification with zoning and had approval for the direction of the modification. S. Indermuehle noted that the fence height was a total of six feet and that it would transition up where the raised patio transitioned up; the paint stain for fencing would be Sherwin Williams and would be a neutral color to blend in with the landscaping. The Commission members noted that color was not within jurisdiction except for permanent materials.

S. Perry asked about the stone material and P. Vieira asked whether one riser and the changes in height posed a safety issue. S. Indermuehle stated that this was viewed as a landing; S. Perry commented that this worked architecturally. S. Perry asked if the top matched the foundation; S. Indermuehle noted that one riser did not expose the mismatch between the stucco and the foundation; two risers would expose the mismatch.

W. Roesner motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the exception of the back fence which would be approved if it was extended to the property line instead of turning back; the Commission recommended that the fence should match the current extension beyond the property line, if the neighbor would agree. S. Perry seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 4-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 17, 2014

SUBJECT: 25 Chestnut Hill Terrace - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 17, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 25 Chestnut Hill Terrace to replace the existing deck and to add a fence and a terrace with the exception of the back fence which would be approved if it was extended to the property line instead of turning back; the Commission recommended that the fence should match the current extension beyond the property line, if the neighbor would agree.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Joyce Dostale, Acting Chair
Peter Vieira, Alternate

William Roesner, Member

Samuel Perry, Alternate

18 Nancy Road – Certificate of Appropriateness

The owner, Michael Simon, and the landscape architect, Carroll Williamson presented the proposed project to build a retaining wall across the front of the property and to replace the existing walkway. They stated that the house was built in the 1950s or 1960s and was redeveloped in the 2000s. After the redevelopment, they were left with the original flagstone walk, the brick cheek walls and brick risers and brick treads. The intent was to improve the street façade by removing the existing rubble wall and building a short puddingstone wall, and by replacing the existing walkway with a new bluestone walk way (of bluestone).

Materials Reviewed:

Plans

Discussion ensued as to whether the puddingstone would fit in with the character of the property, the period and the streetscape, and whether the addition of two new stone materials would make it too busy. W. Roesner commented that the puddingstone would not tie in with the stone façade around the garage door and the driveway wall and was not appropriate to the period. S. Perry noted that the Commission had worked hard to maintain the post-World War II streetscape of one-story ranch houses and that the front veneer was part of the original material; he commented that he liked puddingstone and the puddingstone might not stand out with proper landscaping. M. Simon noted that there was an old puddingstone wall at the back of the property and that he wanted to use a material that was natural and unique to the area. S. Perry commented that the Commission had approved natural fieldstone walls; J. Dostale noted that this was the only stonewall on this street. P. Vieira asked whether the slope could be graded to eliminate the need for a wall; M. Simon stated that the neighbors had tried that and it did not work well.

S. Perry asked what the height of the current wall was; C. Williamson stated that it was two feet high; C. Williamson noted that they were working with R.P. Marzilli (landscape contractor). S. Perry commented that the height could be low enough and puddingstone could improve the property; W. Roesner commented that the mix of two materials would not be appropriate, it should be one or the other. C. Williamson commented that plantings would minimize it; S. Perry commented that that could work.

P. Vieira asked whether the two walls met at the corner; C. Williamson did not know but stated that they would do the cheek walls and redo the steps. P. Vieira noted that the wall at the corner would have to be three feet high; C. Williamson stated that it was fieldstone pressed into the earth, a rip rap slope all covered up. P. Vieira asked whether they would pour foundation for the steps; C. Williamson replied that they would. P. Vieira noted that they could return the wall from the driveway up to the steps and then find a way to transition to a more natural wall once they are beyond that; the corner was the biggest issue. C. Williamson agreed that the corner was problematic because of the sugar maple tree. C. Williams stated that Marzilli would do the structural work - new cheek walls and new risers and new treads; they would get rid of the original brick and would not build a new wall in front of tree.

J. Dostale commented that there seemed to be a lot of different materials and colors; she also noted that although bluestone was presented for the new walkway, the plans identified the new walkway material as pink limestone. J. Dostale motioned to accept the application as submitted with the following adjustments: that the riser steps would be bluestone and not pink limestone. The motion was not seconded. J. Dostale stated that it was important to know the colors of the materials and that what was specified in the application was what was being used; C. Williamson said that they would come back with the exact sample and asked for clarification about the use of the puddingstone. J. Dostale stated that if they wanted to, the review could be continued to the next meeting to get specific information about the proposed materials; she recommended providing revised plans with information on the specific materials and where they would be used, as well as details on where the stones would be placed and how they would deal with the turning corner. J. Dostale also recommended that someone from Marzilli be present at the next meeting to answer questions about the project. B. Kurze will provide information about the next meeting and the submission deadline.

82 Beacon Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Kevin Gerhart from Pella Windows represented the owners, Andrew and Connie Jackson, and presented the project to replace eight window units on the front of the building. The proposed work would be a continuation of an earlier project which replaced all the windows at the back and sides of the house. The proposed work included two groups of three units plus two units. The installation would be identical to the previous work: aluminum clad wood windows, double pane, no mutins or grilles, and the exterior trim would be replaced with pre-primed and painted cedar wood. The permit numbers for the earlier work were 08020587 and 07110434. The intent was to have a unified look for the windows.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Materials information

S. Perry noted that the windows that were being replaced had no dividers so the existing windows were probably replacements. P. Vieira asked when the earlier work was done; K. Gerhart did not know but thought it was in 2011 with an earlier phase in 2008; the information would be on the permits. W. Roesner asked if there were three proposed locations of changes and whether they would do exactly what was done before; K. Gerhart stated that there were four locations and the work on the right side would match the same window, profile and color of paint as what was

previously done on the left. P. Vieira recommended confirming that the earlier replacements were clad and that the proposed matches what was previously approved.

J. Dostale motioned to accept the application as submitted pending Commission staff confirmation that the replacement front windows match the front windows previously approved. S. Perry seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 4-0.

K. Gerhart agreed to work with B. Kurze to confirm what was previously approved for the front windows and to match what was approved before if the new proposal was different.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 17, 2014

SUBJECT: 82 Beacon Street

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 17, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0:

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 82 Beacon Street to install eight replacement front windows once Commission Staff has confirmed that the replacement front windows match the front windows previously approved.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Joyce Dostale, Acting Chair
Peter Vieira, Alternate

William Roesner, Member

Samuel Perry, Alternate

163 Suffolk Road – Certificate of Appropriateness

The new owner of the property, Ruthanne Fuller, and the architect, Monika Pauli, presented the proposal for a garage addition. The previous owners received approval to build a garage addition. Because of concerns with hitting the garage, the design was revised to make the garage smaller to improve the access to the garage. M. Pauli provided hard copies of the previously approved design. M. Pauli noted that the elevations, materials and overall design were not changed and presented the changes included in the revised design as follows:

- Chopped basement corner
- Sank grade a little bit
- Pushed door in
- Shortened side of garage so in fact making it smaller.
- Added roof deck to match the roof deck on the house (Commission members had proposed this change at the previous meeting)

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Elevations

Plans

S. Perry noted that when the driveway was put in, the Commission had proposed a single driveway shared with the neighbors and suggested this might be worth re-visiting. J. Dostale asked about the staircase; M. Pauli stated that it would be an interior staircase and would be the main entrance to the house and R. Fuller noted that this was approved at the last meeting and that they were just making it shorter. J. Dostale asked about the overhang and M. Pauli noted that they had eliminated the extra overhang. There was some discussion about how drainage and gas leakage would be addressed; M. Pauli noted that they were working on those solutions. S. Perry commented that the design was a great improvement. M. Pauli and R. Fuller requested a minor change related to the deck repair - to remove the caps on the walls (which were replacements) and to replace them with caps that would have the same level of detail as the originals; W. Roesner commented that restoring the detail would be nice and S. Perry stated that this was an inconsequential change and should be incorporated in the motion. J. Dostale asked for clarification on the proposed pre-existing window swap; M. Pauli stated that they were re-using existing windows in different locations. S. Perry noted that the windows may have been moved before; W. Roesner and S. Perry commented that the windows looked good.

J. Dostale motioned to accept the application as submitted for the garage and the window swapping plus a recommendation to replace any missing moldings to match the existing moldings on the existing porch and a recommendation to check with ISD regarding the sloping garage floor. W. Roesner seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 4-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 17, 2014

SUBJECT: 163 Suffolk Road

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 17, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0:

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 163 Suffolk Road for the attached rear garage and the window-swapping on the rear second story, plus a recommendation to replace any missing moldings to match the existing moldings on the porch and a recommendation to check with ISD regarding the sloping garage floor.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Joyce Dostale, Acting Chair
Peter Vieira, Alternate

William Roesner, Member

Samuel Perry, Alternate

374 Hammond Street – Working Session

The owner, Bruce MacDonald, requested the extension of the demolition permit which was issued last June. P. Vieira requested clarification of the terms of the extension and J. Dostale stated that the Commission was extending the timeline for the permit under the same conditions previously approved and that demolition was contingent upon approval of the proposed design. Commission members noted that the City of Newton would also have to approve the demolition permit and that one of the previous conditions was that the material from the stone foundation

would have to remain on the property and could be re-purposed for landscaping and other features.

J. Dostale motioned to extend the demolition permit for one year under the same conditions and terms previously stated. W. Roesner seconded the motion. This motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

The owners, B. MacDonald and Julie MacDonald, asked the commission to provide recommendations so that they could give better direction to the architect. B. MacDonald noted that they had considered a structure with a driveway on the right hand side and a detached garage in the rear. W. Roesner recommended that the driveway come off of the side street; S. Perry noted that some of the options were coming off of Hammond Street or off of Reservoir Avenue and going to the back. S. Perry stated that it was inappropriate to have a circular driveway in front as all the corner lots on Hammond had entrances from the side street. B. MacDonald commented that there were safety issues with access from Reservoir Avenue. S. Perry recommended that they walk Hammond Street to see how this was addressed on other properties.

K. Holmes requested clarification as to whether Bruce and Julie MacDonald still owned the property; B. MacDonald replied that they were still the owners of record.

S. Perry commented that he preferred a driveway with a detached garage as everything was very visible with the trees all cut down. B. MacDonald commented that moving the proposed garage would shrink the footprint which was a concern. S. Perry noted that there was an example of a stone and clapboard structure with the garage setback on Acacia and Stone that minimized the garage. S. Perry stated that the proposed project could not compete with the church or with the other houses; had to consider fitting in to a relatively small and very visible lot that framed Reservoir Avenue. S. Perry stated that an attached garage would have to have the connection hidden from the public view, especially from Hammond Street.

B. MacDonald asked whether clapboard was appropriate; P. Vieira noted that many of the houses in the neighborhood used clapboard. W. Roesner asked about the footprint relative to the existing house; B. MacDonald stated that it was the same size. There was discussion about the appropriate setback; S. Perry noted that the houses on the same side of the property (coming down Hammond Street from Beacon) were set back about 40 feet and the garages were also set back. J. Dostale noted that the houses on the opposite side were newer.

B. MacDonald asked whether there were any particular architectural details that should be incorporated. S. Perry recommended that he look at houses in the neighborhood with stone and shingles that did not draw attention; the house should fit in. W. Roesner commented that an excellent contemporary design would be interesting.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 17, 2014

SUBJECT: 374 Hammond Street

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 17, 2014 the Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission, by vote of 4-0:

RESOLVED to extend the demolition permit for 374 Hammond Street for one year under the same conditions and terms previously stated.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Joyce Dostale, Acting Chair
Peter Vieira, Alternate

William Roesner, Member

Samuel Perry, Alternate

Administrative Discussion:

Approval of Minutes

The Commission approved the March 2014 minutes.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:05.

Recorded by Barbara Kurze, Senior Preservation Planner